1	İ	
	Case 2:23-cv-00940-KJM-CKD Docume	ent 10 Filed 10/25/23 Page 1 of 2
1		
2		
3		
4		
5		
6		
7		
8	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	
9	FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA	
10		
11	ENIO ZARAGOZA SANTA CRUZ,	No. 2:23-cv-0940 CKD P
12	Petitioner,	
13	v.	ORDER AND
14	WARDEN, U.S.P. LOMPOC,	FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS
15	Respondent.	
16		
17	On August 18, 2023, petitioner's petition for a writ of habeas was dismissed with leave to	
18	amend. Petitioner was warned the failure to file an amended petition would result in a	
19	recommendation that this action be dismissed. The time provided to petitioner to file an amended	
20	petition has expired and petitioner has not filed an amended petition.	
21	Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that the Clerk of the Court assign a district	
22	court judge to this case; and	
23	IT IS HEREBY RECOMMENDED that this action be dismissed without prejudice. See	
24	Local Rule 110; Fed. R. Civ. P. 41(b).	
25	These findings and recommendations are submitted to the United States District Judge	
26	assigned to the case, pursuant to the provisions of 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(l). Within fourteen days	
27	after being served with these findings and recommendations petitioner may file written objections	
28	with the court. Such a document should be captioned "Objections to Magistrate Judge's Findings	
		1

Case 2:23-cv-00940-KJM-CKD Document 10 Filed 10/25/23 Page 2 of 2

and Recommendations." In his objections petitioner may address whether a certificate of			
appealability should issue in the event he files an appeal of the judgment in this case. See Rule			
11, Federal Rules Governing Section 2254 Cases (the district court must issue or deny a			
certificate of appealability when it enters a final order a	dverse to the applicant). Where, as here, a		
habeas petition is dismissed on procedural grounds, a certificate of appealability "should issue if			
the prisoner can show: (1) 'that jurists of reason would find it debatable whether the district court			
was correct in its procedural ruling;' and (2) 'that jurists of reason would find it debatable			
whether the petition states a valid claim of the denial of a constitutional right." Morris v.			
Woodford, 229 F.3d 775, 780 (9th Cir. 2000) (quoting Slack v. McDaniel, 529 U.S. 473, 484			
(2000)). Petitioner is advised that failure to file objections within the specified time may waive			
the right to appeal the District Court's order. Martinez v. Ylst, 951 F.2d 1153 (9th Cir. 1991).			
Dated: October 25, 2023	woh U. Delany		
CAROL	LYN K. DELANEY		
UNITE	D STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE		

- -

sant0940.fta.hab